

Date: Thu, 10 Mar 94 04:30:13 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #116
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 10 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 116

Today's Topics:

CW

Free GMRS Repeater

How can I *LEGALLY* change my Ham radio to send/receive Marine B
Morse Whiners (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 9 Mar 94 18:49:06 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!
ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <117@ted.win.net> mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>In article <CLz66M.Lp0@freenet.carleton.ca>, Maria L. Evans

(ap164@FreeNet.Carleton.CA) writes:

>>

>>However...do I think I HAVE to have that skill to be a "real" ham?

>>No. I'm a "real" ham because I know enough about radio theory to

>>solder a connector, make a dipole, climb a tower. Now, that may

>>not be everyone's definition, but it's MINE...for me.

>

>Ouch! I know you were trying to be brief, but what you've described in

>no way justifies our occupation of 10% of the spectrum below 1.3GHz.

>The notion of us all defining for ourselves what a ham is doesn't

>accomplish anything. The only question that matters is what are we

>doing with our spectrum to justify our continued occupation of it. I
>believe that technical exploration and education is the best
>justification we have, followed by our ability to be a parallel
>communications asset for emergencies and other unusual circumstances.

The FCC spells out in Part 97 what our basis and purpose is. That's to be a self training ground for technicians and operators to push the envelope and to provide public service. Realistically we know that only a few percent of any large group contains those who push and advance. They have to drag the rest, kicking and screaming, out of the trees and into a semblance of the 20th century. We also know, however, that that percentage is relatively fixed, a bell curve, so by introducing more people to the pool, a greater absolute number of the bright and eager will be ensnared as well.

>I believe CW is an asset in both of these cases. In the first case, >specifically, I think a person can build a *useful* CW station much >easier than building a *useful* SSB station. Whether CW is enough of an >asset to be a requirement is a legitimate question to debate. When people >say "I just want to get on phone", or "other digital modes are more >reliable than CW", one follow-up question I don't hear is "At what >expense?" All this gear that people want to use instead of CW is >*expensive*. Are we going to make this exclusively a rich person's hobby? >Where does that leave the young beginner with lots of interest but not >much money? Realistically, if the CW requirement were removed for HF, the >CW portions of the bands would shrink due to pressure from the no-coders. >Anyone who doesn't believe this doesn't know the history of the band >allocations. Will this be another case of money squeezing out enthusiasm?

The old cry of "CW *transmitters* are easy" is wearing a bit thin. I can answer "so are FSK transmitters". The hard part in both cases is a quality *receiver*, and the requirements for receivers are nearly identical for either mode. Most bright teenagers already have a computer, and a Baycom adapter is literally *pennies*. No, CW is not much cheaper than other modes, but it is lots *slower* and lots more *anachonistic* than other modes. Might as well have teenagers out sending smoke signals for the good it'll do them in finding a real job out in the real world where CW usage is virtually nil.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 10 Mar 94 07:04:17 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!jangus@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Free GMRS Repeater
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CMEyD9.1C7@wang.com> dbushong@wang.com writes:

```
> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:
>
> >In article <cntrspy2CMEG9F.IE5@netcom.com> cntrspy2@netcom.com writes:
>
> [ 16 lines of original quoted posting ]
>
> > There you have it. A perfect example of contentless communication.
>
> > Unless of course it was shameless "ad".
> [ .sig removed ]
>
> Agreed. 29 lines of nothing useful, plus a one-line description of it.
> --
> Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.
>
```

This is a joke, right Dave? You quoted everything again and then followed up with a single line. Have you contracted the Posting Virus that seems to have infected some of the other news groups. (Notably alt.tv.tiny-toons.sex)

I posted the article in response to the usual rants about most amateurs doing "contentless" QSOs that have been going on along with the usual raving about CW (or the language of the morrisians from the Isle of Dot) and "geezers".

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA	"You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com	a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749	story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080	Peking Noodle Co.

Date: 10 Mar 94 05:06:06 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: How can I *LEGALLY* change my Ham radio to send/receive Marine B
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> Well, maybe. I read in W5YI or Westlink or something, within the last
> couple of months, about a fellow who while hiking out West somewhere
> had an emergency in a ravine. Big radio hole. He tried ham
> repeaters. He tried simplex. He tried GMRS. He tried *cellphone*.
> Nothing, zilch, silence, and no service, in that order. He tried
> local sheriff's frequency and was able to get some help. Well, I
> guess the Law and the FCC were not pleased he had used that frequency
> without authorization, seized his radio, and may for all I know have
> taken action to impose a fine or suspension or other such nonsense,
> though I'm not sure.
>
> Needless to say, many folks are outraged. This fellow wants his
> (non-type-accepted) radio back. Last I heard, the FCC had reopened
> the matter for consideration.
>
> I don't have the information in front of me, so I apologize for any
> distortions. Yes, in an emergency, I'd rather get help than keep my
> radio, and being able to use almost any frequency necessary to get
> help makes a good deal of common sense, but (unless someone else has
> better information) it's not clear just yet that it's FCC policy.
> We'll see.

I agree. And all the rules I have read CLEARLY state that in an
emergency ANY transmissions are leagle. HOW can the FCC allow the
procecutation, by a county sheriff, of a matter solely under FCC
jursdiction and CLEARLY permitted by the rules.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: Thu, 10 Mar 94 06:56:47 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!jangus@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar9.230919.3435@es.dupont.com> collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com
writes:

> (IMHO) I think the decline of *courtesy*, *fairness*, *respect for others*
> and the increase of everything thats rude and foul on the airwaves
> is not from the decline in the licensing. Rather, from the general

> decline in *decent* human behavior over the last 15 years or so.

Thanks Tom for pointing out what should be obvious.

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA		"You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com		a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749		story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080		Peking Noodle Co.

Date: 10 Mar 94 05:10:28 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cro@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Christoper Ogren) writes:

> In article <1cuqic2w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Picke
> |> It is still not necessary and there are methods that beat manual morse.
> |> So why not have everyone tested on the method(s) that BEAT the
> |> PERFORMANCE of manual morse? WHY? Because it is not relevant. Did YOUR
> |> driving test include the space shuttle? No? Why not, if you have to
> |> reenter the atmosphere, it is a necessary skill and should be on the
> |> driving test.

>
> Your assumption is partly incorrect. Manual morse cannot be beat under
> some circumstances. Sometimes emergency traffic is best handled via CW.
> Just because you might not like it doesn't mean you shouldn't need to
> learn it. It's not just a hobby people, it's also an adventure.

Given DSP technology and encoding methods appriate to the use, manual
morse can and has been beat by a factor of several db. And digital data
may be best suited for emergency communications. Digital data is AT
LEAST as effecent as morse. Arguably, several times better than manual
morse.

Gary, I don't have the stats since my system crash, can you post them.

Dan N8PKV

--
"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 10 Mar 94 05:16:03 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) writes:
>
> > Survive as in to exist into the next century in ANY form.
>
> Boy, there is an intelligent position to take. Let's sacrifice our
> ethics and morals as amateur operators in an attempt to "save"
> something that, for all intents and purposes, didn't need saving.
>
> Another part of the Great Lie(tm): we need to "save" amateur radio.
> Has there ever been a DECLINE in the number of amateur operators
> over the past 20 years? As far as I can find out: No.

I don't have the numbers in front of me, perhaps one of the guys at the
League does.

> Oh, but the "average age" is rising. Has anyone ever bothered to
> examine what the "average age" of a NEW ham is? Prior to Feb 1991,
> that is? I didn't think so.
>
>
> > I again must take exception to you general assement of 2-Meters and
> > above. Except for certin isolated incidents, some having NOTHING to do
> > with operators that have not passed a code test, 2-Meters is about the
> > same as it was 6 or 7 years ago when I first started listening. And I
> > have friends that tell me it has not changed much in the 20 years that
> > they have been licensed. If it is worse where you are I am sorry, but
> > please do not make a blanket statement that seems to imply a NATIONAL
> > problem, that IMO does not exist.
>
> My comments, numerous times, have been predicated with the disclaimer that
> I am describing the situation as it exists here in RI. I don't make this
> disclaimer in every posting, since it would be redundant.

If the disclaimer is redundant, why isn't the comment?

> The face of VHF/UHF amateur radio in this area has changed dramatically

> in the 10 years I've been around. For that matter, even HF operations have
> changed. 10 years ago, you'd never hear a CW station keying up over another.
> Today, you're in the middle of a QSO and all of a sudden someone will come
> out with a CQ CQ DE without even calling QRL? first. Unreal, and unheard of
> 10 years ago.

But Michael, the no-code license that you seem to blame for the decline
(the Great Lie(tm) comments) has only been here for couple of years! No
where near 10!

> Maybe the VHF/UHF problems do not exist in your area, however, do not make a
> blanket assumption that there are not major problems elsewhere. You are
> doing the same thing that you are accusing me of doing: making a blanket
> statement. Realize that some of us do think there is a problem, and we are
> frustrated by what we see as a disturbing trend in amateur radio - a sacrific
> of operator quality for sheer quantity.

There are problems all over. A great deal with operators who HAVE passed
the code.

> People say: "Oh, but we need numbers to protect spectrum." Yeah. And what do
> you think the FCC and others will say when all they hear on VHF/UHF is a
> bunch of "smokey reports"? Yeah, by lowering standards we're really protectin
> ourselves alright.

So help correct it by working to make the standards higher, but code
will not, nor would it have, save(d) amateur radio.

> > More techs around here would go to 220 but are not because it is
> > 'threatened' and feel that the FCC might make the investment worthless
> > if the band is lost. Now 440 is a different matter, as is packet. Packet
> > is JAMMED here on 2-Meter and 220 and 440 packet is exploding.
>
> Get them on 900mhz and 1.2 ghz. Protect that spectrum.

A lot of the people on 1.2 around here are (or started as) 'no-codes'.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."
-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 10 Mar 94 03:24:58 GMT

From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar3.224720.1107@ve6mgs.ampr.org>, <xU0qPNB.edellers@delphi.com>,
<1994Mar7.183548.22887@ve6mgs.ampr.org>
Subject : Re: New Canadian prefixes?

Mark G. Salyzyn <mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org> writes:

>CB ... International? The complaints may have roared in, but the international
>community *can* *not* prevent it on an allocation that was supposed to be
>for local communications.

The allocation doesn't matter -- ALL stations are supposed to have call signs,
and those call signs are supposed to start with a prefix assigned to that
country, so that if a station causes interference to another in a different
country the other administration knows which administration to contact to get
the matter cleared up. (The one big loophole is that each administration
determines if, and when, each station must use its call sign on the air.)

Date: 9 Mar 94 19:15:26 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!
ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2D726467@msmail.uthscsa.edu>,
<rcrw90-280294155811@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>,
<CM9vD2.1Ho@news.Hawaii.Edu>p
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: CW

In article <CM9vD2.1Ho@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey
Herman) writes:

>In article <rcrw90-280294155811@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>
rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:
>>In article <2D726467@msmail.uthscsa.edu>, MUENZLERK@uthscsa.EDU (Muenzler,
>>Kevin) wrote:
>>> Don't forget,
>>> ham radio began in CW.
>>
>>Not quite, ham radio began with spark, CW is a relative newcommer to the
>>scene. Actually as one poster pointed out, hams were playing with "voice"
>>even before CW came along - I would still like to see a spark driven voice
>>transmitter!

>
>Most of us are guilty of interchanging the words CW and code; I'm sure
>Kevin means '...ham radio began with code.'

Only those who confuse the message with the messenger. :-)

>CW is not a relative newcommer; regular CW communication followed regular
>spark comms only by about 20 years (note I said regular comms, i.e., day-to-
>day usage for local, national, and international comms, as opposed to 'experi-
>mentation'). And 'playing with' does not imply day-to-day usage, just
>experimentation. So Kevin is quite right. And of course, the commercial
>folks followed us, so day-to-day commercial communications started with
>code, too.

But thankfully most commercial communications quickly moved on to more
capable modes. Now it's only the amateurs who lag behind, dragged down
by an anachronistic testing requirement.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #116
